

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                           | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/510,190                                | 02/22/2000      | Wataru Ito           | 2091-0208P                   | 2136             |  |
| 7   | 590 12/29/2003  | EXAMINER             |                              |                  |  |
| Birch Stewart Kolasch & Birch LLP         |                 |                      | SUKHAPHADHANA, CHRISTOPHER T |                  |  |
| PO BOX 747<br>Falls Church, VA 22040-0747 |                 |                      | ART UNIT                     | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| r and Charen,                             | 711 220-10-0/4/ |                      | 2625                         | 10               |  |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003      | 12               |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| •  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |                                   |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| Advisory Action  | 09/510,190  | ITO, WATARU  |                                   |
| , avicery riesen   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |                                   |
|  | Christopher T. Sukhaphadhana  | 2625   |                                   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence addres   | is                                |
| THE REPLY FILED 02 December 2003 FAILS TO PLATHEREFORE, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | avoid abandonment of this application 1) a timely filed amendment whit all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time | cation. A proper reply<br>ch places the applicat               | to a<br>ion in                    |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | EPLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |                                   |
| <ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advantage</li> </ul>  | -   | e final rejection, whichever is                                | later In no                       |
| event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).   | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o   | f the final rejection.   |                                   |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the distance statutory period for reply originally set in              | fee. The appropriate extens<br>the final Office action; or (2) | sion fee under<br>as set forth in |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF  | •   |  |                                   |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by  | ecause:   |  |                                   |
| (a) $oxed{\boxtimes}$ they raise new issues that would require furth   | er consideration and/or search (  | see NOTE below);   |                                   |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note  | below);   |  |                                   |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or   | in better form for appeal by mat  | erially reducing or sim  | plifying the                      |
| (d) M they present additional claims without cance   | ling a corresponding number of  | finally rejected claims  |                                   |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.  |   |  |                                   |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection  | ction(s):   |  |                                   |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a s  | separate, timely filed a                                       | mendment                          |
| 5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:   |   | sidered but does NOT   | place the                         |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | cause it is not directed SOLELY   | to issues which were   | newly                             |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w   |   |  | d an                              |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows  | :   |  |                                   |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |  |                                   |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |  |                                   |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .  |   |  |                                   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |  |                                   |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app   | proved or b) $\square$ disapproved by   | the Examiner.  |                                   |

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)





Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the broadening of the limitations from "a face area" or "a flesh area" to "an area" or "an image area" in all the independent claims raises new issues requiring further search and/or consideration.

/BKÄVESH M. MEHTA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**